Bexley Heritage Lectures
CAN THE PEOPLE RULE?
"Democratic Ideas in Renaissance and Reformation"
John M. Buchanan
November 18,1984

The danger, of course, is over-simplification. A topic as sweeping as this invites it. And that, I hope, we can avoid this evening. This idea is so good, and the people in charge have worked so hard, and you are so admirable to leave the warmth of fireside and family on a cold November evening to reflect on Democratic Ideas in the Middle Ages. However, the danger is real. I am reminded of a story the late Rosalind Russell used to enjoy telling on herself. She was on a trans-Atlantic cruise, sitting on a deck chair on a sunny afternoon, beside a man who had a terrible cold...sneezing, blowing his nose, coughing. "I think if you'll go to bed early, drink a lot of fluids, and take two aspirin, you will feel better in the morning," she said. The man did not respond. So she tried again: "My name is Rosalind Russell, you know, I make movies." The man thanked her and said, "And my name is Charles Mayo. I run a medical clinic." (Hoover Rupert in Outlook, 10/23/83, p. 11)

The danger is over-simplification. It is an honor to share the platform this evening with Walter Bouman and Frank Lane. Unlike Miss Russell I, at least, know with whom I am on this journey.

The topic might appear remote and safely abstract. But the relationship between church and state and between religion and life, and the existence of democratic ideas in the matrix are as immediate as the evening news. The American Roman Catholic Bishops have issued a pastoral letter on the subject of poverty and our economic system which, to say the least, has the attention of the American business community and already is stimulating even more discussion of the issue of the role of religion in the life of the body politic. Through the long hot election year, summer into fall, it was the issue that dominated the news. There were more clergy in the New York Times Sunday magazine this fall than in The Catholic Observer. Mario Cuomo, Geraldine Ferraro, Archbishop O'Connor, Jerry Falwell, George Bush, Ronald Reagan, Walter Mondale, and countless others, commented on matters of church and state, religion and life - none very clearly, none very satisfactorily.

And then at the end of our campaign two events happened elsewhere which everyone who think about these things found chilling---Indira Ghandi was shot by her Sikh guards, and Solidarity priest Father Popieluszko was beaten and drowned. In an essay that week Time Magazine observed, "both killings involved clashes between the faithful and the state. In one instance, a religion struck at a government; in the other politics struck at religion. However different their tactics, the Polish priest and the Sikh assassins would both be considered defenders of the faith."

Whenever religious certainty and political power combine in history, human liberty is usually the casualty. When religious certainty has power in the form of a weapon, human life is often the casualty.

The Shiite Moslem militiaman with an M-1 in his hands - has, as described in a recent Times article, "The truth with a capital T, and nothing will stand in his way." Catholics and Protestants cheerfully bombing one another in Belfast, the Grand Inquisitor defending the faith from falsehood - all are convinced that there is no room for compromise or tolerance in the truth as they perceive it.

The late Phyllis McGinly, delightful and witty poet, wrote about two very adamant Reformers Zwingli and Muntzer, under the title "How to Start a War." The two were strong and outspoken and one of their major differences was on the mode of baptism - sprinkling or total immersion.

"Said Zwingli to Muntzer,
'I'll have to be blunt, sir.
I don't like your version of
Total Immersion.
And since God's on my side
And I'm on the dry side,
You'd better swing ovah
To me and Jehovah.'
Cried Muntzer, 'It's schism,
Is Infant Baptism!
Since I've had a sign, sir,
That God's will is mine, sire,
Let all men agree
With Jehovah and me,
Or go to Hell, singly,'
Said Muntzer to Zwingli,
As each drew his sword
On the side of the Lord."

When the government gets to define the truth and to decide what the official religion will be - the results are not particularly good for the human community and certainly not conducive to freedom. The outcome can be the hell of Orwell's 1984, or the constriction of Imperial Rome in which it was first a crime to be a Christian and then, later, a bad idea not to be. Democracy, I wish to argue, requires a freedom of conscience and spirit which is precious and rare and fragile. I wish further to suggest that Democracy is philosophically possible only where that freedom of conscience is protected, often against the will of the majority, and officially encouraged by the government; and that the philosophic roots of that idea did some interesting deepening and growing in the Middle Ages, particularly within two movements known as Renaissance and Reformation.

First, let's look at the Middle Ages - the thousand years from 500 A.D. to 1500 A.D., or from Constantine to Luther, or from the fall of Rome to the emergence of the modern Nation State.

What was it like to live then? It wasn't crowded for one thing. The 14th century population of England was 2.2 million, France - 16 million.

The system the times developed for the ordering of life was called Feudalism. The basic institutions were castle, village, fief. If you were a Lord you lived in a castle; if you were a common person you were probably a

vassal which meant you had entered into a tight, subordinate relationship with a lord. You swore your fidelity in a solemn ceremony - for which you received a piece of the lord's land and the protection of his army, of which you were a member, as necessary; and access to his justice when you needed some. What you owed the lord was castle duty when the lord was being attacked; and court service, which meant coming to the castle at the lord's summons, to resolve disputes among peers, and sometimes even to give the lord advice. And you owed an economic obligation. On three occasions the lord could count on your financial contribution: if he was captured in a war and required a ransom, for the marriage of his eldest daughter, and when his eldest son became a knight.

If you were in the Feudal system, you were fairly comfortable and secure. Of course, many people weren't in. The peasants, for instance, had the protection of no laws, no constitution. They were simply there, at the perimeters of the system, hoping to get by - by serving a vassal as worker, servant, or as a beggar, forager, hunter.

There were knights, whose lives were devoted to the art and science of fighting. They were trained, "dubbed" at 21, and when not off fighting, practiced fighting by engaging in tournaments - the Middle Ages version of War Games.

Knights did abide by a code of chivalry - which protected everyone, even themselves, from the more violent possibilities of their science. Knights, as you know, were well protected in battle, but the incredible weight of armour meant that you couldn't wear it much. In fact, if you were out being a knight, it required a few people riding behind to carry the armour. If you should happen to encounter your enemy, chivalry required taking the time to put on the armour before battle commenced - the object of which was not to kill your foe but to capture him. One historian observes: "No one, as a rule, had any desire to kill anyone. A dead enemy was just a useless corpose and the slain man's son was ready to take his place. But, a captive could be held for ransom. In the decisive battle of Lincoln in 1217, there were 510 knights on each side, only one died and everyone felt very badly about the unfortunate occurrence." (Medieval Society, Sidney Painter, p. 29) The high point of chivalric behavior was the voluntary return of King John of France - to his English prison, when he found he was unable to raise his ransom.

Women in the feudal system were in the custody, or care, or protection of the men. At least, that's what it appeared. Actually, we know different. Women ran the system. In addition to spinning, weaving, sewing they supervised the complex operation of estate, or household, most of the time without the presence of a male who was out riding around in his armour, acting important, but actually accomplishing very little.

With the exception of the lords people ate mostly bread, some cheese, vegetables from a small garden. Fish and chicken were rare luxuries - meat rarer still.

At the top of the system was a king, then dukes who owned estates and who owed him fealty. In turn they were served by counts, barons, lords, and knights.

It was a fairly effective system. By the 14th and 15th centuries, it was ending. Many lords were charging rent for their arable fields, and by the 16th century the system was almost gone. Nobility faded as the merchants cornered the money. Knights were replaced by merceneries to do the fighting. Chivalry, which was dealt a terrible blow by the lethal crossbow, ended with the gun. Killing replaced capturing. It was not a democratic system obviously. There was not much about it to relate to Greek and Roman concepts of government. But it provided a beginning, at least in the abstract, of the suggestion that at some points in life, the people have rights.

One scholar observes: "The feudal class was a ruling aristocracy, but within its own ranks its political ideals were essentially democratic. The fief was ruled more by the vassals than by the lord, and the basic conception of government by mutual agreement, implied in feudal customs, provided the chief justifications for later efforts to limit royal authority and has come to be recognized as an important source for the modern conviction that human rights and dignity are safe only within the framework of a constitution." (Painter, ibid., p. 100)

Every village had a church. Cities had many. There were 120 churches in London in 1250. In addition there were thousands of religious communities - monasteries.

After the fall of Rome and the disintegration of the Empire the Christian Church remained as the strongest, most visible, most cohesive institution. Historians have long noted that out of the ashes of Imperial Rome rose the Roman Church and on the foundation of Caesar's throne, Peter's successors sat. Even the language was preserved. After the emperors, the most powerful individual in the old imperial city was the bishop of Rome. The father - papa - pope - had enough power and money to raise an army and engage the relentless barbarians in battle. And when on Christmas Day, in the year 800 A>D>, Pope Leo III crowned Charlemagne the Holy Roman Emperor, the church clearly was superior to any government on earth. By 1073, under the brilliant papacy of Gregory the Great, the church was the undisputed dominant force in Western civilization, strong enough to launch and carry out the crusades.

But there were deep stirrings in Western civilization which would result in two of those grand historic movements, named only in retrospect, understood only in retrospect, which clearly are determining points in the human story...Renaissance and Reformation.

Professor Bronowski writes that when the Renaissance began depends on what you think it was. The Renaissance, he says, is:

1. The birth of modern man and woman and the rediscovery of the human individual.

2. The birth of emperical science which pays more attention to nature than to theological dogma.

3. The emergence of the secular concept of the state.

4. New attention to fame, glory and the expression of human personality, as in art, sculpture.

5. The exploration of the world.

It is helpful to be reminded that for a long period of Western history those activities were not happening. It is sometimes called the Dark Ages. What the Greeks and Romans celebrated in poetry, drama, architecture, learning was shelved. The Renaissance is their recovery and with it a great rediscovery of our humanity.

One of the interesting expressions of that rebirth was the development of a new political structure in what we now know as Italy. Milan, Venice, Florence, Roman, Naples emerged as independent city-states. Trade flourished, which in turn created banking, the need for bookkeeping and, say the historians, the beginning of capitalism, i.e. the idea that the individual might earn a profit. Politically and philosophically, however, the interesting thing about the Italian city-states of the Renaissance was that they were not dominated by the church, and developed a fairly sophisticated notion of a religiously neutral political state. In terms of the humanistic recovery of the person, the names of the Renaissance are among the best we have ever produced.

Leonardo de Vinci, in the midst of his amazingly accurate anatomical notes made the discovery that liberated the human intellect and invented science, namely that "Nature speaks to us in detail, and that only through the detailed can we find the grand design." (Bronowski and Mazlish, p. 18) Leonardo was what we know as a Renaissance man - inventor, painter, sculptor, military planner, scholar.

Machiavelli, humanist, philosopher, and poet adopted an original and rigorously secular attitude toward politics and understood the potential of power and the emergence of the nation state.

In England, in conjunction with Henry VIII's problem producing an heir, the Renaissance found one of its most interesting and, I think, most appealing expressions - the life of Thomas More.

More lived between 1478 and 1535, was a profound Christian, concerned with suffering and injustice, who under the influence of the Sermon on the Mount - wrote a book, Utopia, which proposed, among other schemes, the elimination of money and the holding of all goods in common. He was a wealthy and widely respected man. He was summoned by Henry to succeed Cardinal Wolsey as Chancellor, and in spite of his curious ideas, asked for and was granted something called "freedom of conscience." But when Henry married Anne Boleyn and made her Queen of England, Thomas More simply and quietly refused to acknowledge that she was Queen until the Pope said she was legitimately Henry's wife. The Pope didn't. More couldn't and Henry had him executed. Thomas More became a martyr, a symbol of the human spirit holding out against the power of the state. He was an unlikely revolutionary. He simply wished to be free to hold his belief and somewhere in that stand is a true liberty, a freedom of the spirit that tyranny cannot abide.

The impetus toward that freedom, I would suggest, may be found deeply in the religious bed rock of Western Civilization - the Judeo/Christian heritage. I wish to argue that even though we have not expressed it institutionally with much consistency, and even though we have ourselves - Catholics and Protestants - been opposed to liberty when we were in power, nevertheless there is within our belief system a deep and abiding affirmation of freedom.

Not all historians would agree with that assertion. One who does wrote: "The seeds of disloyalty to an absolute earthly ruler are inherent in Christianty." (Elliot and MadDonald, p. 292)

From the Hebrew prophets Amos and Jeremiah slinging their barbs at both king and the king's favorite house chaplain and being persecuted for it (please keep religion out of politics!); to Jesus of Nazareth, crucified by the Romans as a threat to the peace and tranquility of the province; to Paul of Tarsus and Simon Peter executed for treason; to Dietrich Bonhoeffer joining an assassanation attempt on Hitler's life; to Martin Luther King deliberately breaking the law in Birmingham; to Desmond Tutu, eloquently pleading that love for God and country calls him to oppose a system of racial oppression which is not only the law of the land but called the will and law of God by the pet religious structures of that land...throughout all of that there is in the Judeo/Christian tradition both an insistance on the rights of conscience of the individual - which is the source of all civil liberty - and also a deep and abiding suspicion of every political structure which accumulates power. We think we know an important secret about humanity and it is that left to our own devices we can be counted on to mess things up. Our word for it is original sin. It makes us suspicious and very nervous when any power is unchecked - ecclesiastical as well as political. At our best we are willing to see that dynamic even in ourselves. We have seen that the combination of religious certainty and political power usually means someone's freedom is about to come to an end.

The Reformation of the 16th century, with all its excesses and tragic abuses, I would suggest, reflected both the Renaissance rediscovery of the human individual and affirmation of human freedom, and also the Judeo/Christian insight into the possibilities of human freedom within a political system.

What was the Reformation? It was Martin Luther, Augustinian monk, on the eve of All Saints Day, nailing to the castle church door in Wittenberg, 95 theses on the subject of indulgences and the decades of political, social and religious turmoil which followed. It was a complex, multifaceted, series of events which divided Europe religiously. "It gave to Europe, as a result of the religious wars that stemmed from it, the political shape which more or less it has kept ever since...At a further remove, the Reformation carried forward into the current which later took the Pilgrim fathers out of England and led to the colonization of North America." (Bronowski, Mazlish, p. 76) There were reformers before Luther, of course. Peter Waldo, St. Francis, Jan Hus, Joan of Arc, Wycliffe - all protested church authority and in most cases the church adjusted and reabsorbed its unhappy children. Luther started a major movement because the time was right.

There are several generally acknowledged reasons why the Lutheran revolt succeeded while others failed or simply faded. The first is that a promising attempt to reform the church from within not only failed but was answered by a new and extreme papal absolutism. The promising reform attempt was called the Conciliar Movement. Led by Marsilius of Padua, it suggested a kind of ecclesiastical rule of the people. Disputes would be settled by councils, not individuals. The conciliarists even proposed a kind of limited constitutional monarchy as a way of governing society and church. The response was in the

form of two strong Papal proclamations called Bulls in 1458 and 1516, reasserting absolute Papal authority over any council. The failure of the Conciliar Movement distressed and disillusioned thoughtful moderate reformers who wished change to happen in the church.

Another factor is that the church prior to the Reformation experienced a sequence of tragedies which concerned even the most devout. A struggle between Philip the Fair and Boniface VIII resulted in Philip making Clement V pope and moving the papacy to Avignon, France between 1309 and 1377. The absence of the popes from Rome and rival claimants to the throne had a disillusioning effect and the cry for reform was heard throughout the church. And then it got worse. Pope Gregory XI returned to Rome, but when he died, the French and Italian cardinals split and for awhile there were two popes. Later a third claimant appeared on the scene.

The third reason why the Lutheran Reformation took hold was the new, critical spirit of the Renaissance, which was examining and reexamining all the old authorities and generally advocating the freedom of the individual from everything that would hem it in - artistically, literally, politically, and ecclesiastically.

Finally, particularly in Germany, there was a new political identity which would one day take shape in the nation state. Patriotism was a factor in a movement which seemed to advocate the loosening of Roman control over the fortunes - political and religious - of people in Germany.

Luther himself was a fascinating personality. Born in 1483, educated for the law at Erfurt, he became an Augustinian monk in 1505, was ordained and taught philosophy at Wittenberg. It was while there that Luther nailed his 95 theses to the church door. What he wanted to do was debate the subject of indulgences. Luther wanted only to reform the church. But, making a very long story very short, he was not only a failure at reforming from within but was excommunicated and, at the Diet of Worms, where he was ordered by the Holy Roman Emperor to recant and where he responded with his famous "Here I stand, I can do no other" speech, he was declared an outlaw with a price on his head.

The German nobles were his strong supporters and before long the churches of the Reformation, Lutheran churches, were part of the German nation and spirit.

The freedom of conscience issue for Luther had to do mainly with the interpretation of scripture. He wrote "I wish to be free. I do not wish to become the slave of any authority, whether that of a council or any other power, of the University or of the Pope. For I shall proclaim with confidence what I believe to be true...whether it is authorized or not by I care not what authority." Although it is here in the context of an in-house debate about who has the authority to interpret scripture, it is philosophically a critical point in the gradual appearance of the idea of the rule of the people.

Luther, himself, was an enigma. He could say something like that about freedom, advocate his own right of conscience and then turn on the peasants who thought they heard him correctly on freedom and equality and rose up against the nobles. "Slaughter them" Luther roared. He was no Renaissance man, brilliant, but not open. "God uses coarse wedges for splitting coarse blocks," he said about himself. "I am rough, boisterous, stormy, and altogether warlike." History has judged his self assessment to be accurate.

To his credit Luther oppossed state-coerced Chrsitianity. There was no room in his theology for a religion forced on non-believers by the state. But he became appallingly anti-semitic in his old age. He taught that the authorities were appointed by God and were to be obeyed - so he can't be pressed into service as an advocate for political liberty. And he wanted the state to support the church so he can't serve as an example of the separation of church and state.

What Luther did, in the framework of political freedom, almost in spite of himself, was advocate the cause of liberty of conscience against any human authority. In the best Judeo/Christian tradition, he is a reminder that in the human story, unchecked authority and power turns out badly - particulary for human freedom.

John Calvin was the leader of the other branch of the Protestant Reformation. A French intellectual, exiled from his native land because of his Reformist proclivities, Calvin became the leading pastor in Geneva and shortly thereafter the dominant political force as well. Calvin wanted the church to be totally independent of the state. In fact, his view was so extreme that he came out at a position that sounded like the state exists to serve the church. Geneva became a theocracy. And to demonstrate again the Christian secret that no one in power is to be trusted for very long, Calvin presided over the execution of 58 people including the famous heretic Servetus. Servetus came to Geneva, having escaped from Vienna, where the Catholics had already condemned him to death by a "slow fire."

Geneva became something of a haven for persecuted refugees. Calvin insitituted a form of public education, a primitive system of labor laws, and wrote theology generally regarded as some of the finest we have ever produced. Even though his own regime was, in many ways, oppressive, "Calvinism in the end was one of the major factors in the achievement of political liberty." (Fosdick, p. 200) The people of Geneva voted for their pastors and members of the town board. It wasn't much, but in the gradual emergence of democratic ideas it was a major turning point. Calvin wrote: "We are subject to men who rule over us, but subject only in the Lord. If they command anything against him, let us not pay the least attention to it."

There it is again! The earliest echoes of the refrain of freedom: the fragile suggestion that there is a limit to what a monarch or a state or a church can demand of an individual; the right to obey one's conscience even if it means disobeying the laws of the civil authority. Calvin wasn't a Democrat either, but I believe Mr. Jefferson wrote what he did in July of 1776, at least in part, because the French Presbyterian reformer broke the ice 240 years earlier in his Geneva study.

Presbyterian scholar Jane Dempsey Douglas wrote recently: "Calvin was an old freedom fighter - even though he, and his Geneva colleagues, did not always see as clearly as we do today the implications of that freedom..." (Princeton Seminary Bulletin, vol. IV, No. 2, Christian Freedom in Calvin's Theology)

What the Christian church maintained throughout the Middle Ages was that there is an independent, higher law, which applied to the ruler and ruled alike. And while the church's interpretation of what that law said may, at times, have been offensive or wrong, the idea that there was such an accountability is a basic part of Western constitutional thinking. This is how a political scientist says it, "The medieval monarch had an institutionalized moral check on his power. This contributes to the basic doctrine and development of constitutionalism - government limited and directed by a moral law. That the check was often flouted is true. But is remained nevertheless as an ideal, and acted as a very real brake on the absolutism of rules." (Elliot and MacDonald, p. 297)

One of Calvin's disciples was a Scottish refugee, John Knox. Knox was a passionate and belligerent reformer who pushed Calvinism to its logical, political conclusion by advocating "the duty of resistance to a king who would not permit the true religion." (ibid., p. 382) Knox hounded Mary Queen of Scots from her throne and planted a fierce Presbyterianism into the Scottish character and many colonists in the new world brought it with them.

Historians note "a natural incompatibility between Calvinist-Presbyterian form of church organization and absolute monarchy" (ibid., p. 381) We Presbyterians are perversely proud of that kind of reputation, as well as the description of the American Revolution by a member of parliament during the war - as a "Presbyterian Revolt."

One of the classic political science modern texts puts the issue succinctly, "Can a state tolerate a belief and an institution in its midst which acknowledges a higher loyalty than one to the ruler? That is the great question for which Western man has sought an answer for nearly two thousand years." (Elliot and MacDonald, p. 298)

Both Fascism and Communism answer that question in the negative. Both demand an ultimate allegiance to Fuhrer, State, or People. Neither can abide for long the existence of civil liberty which grants radical freedom of religion, freedom to obey one's conscience - to its citizens. Both must go through the charade of seeming to provide that freedom and both do it by attempting to control the free exercise of religion very carefully.

Mr. Jefferson thought it possible. Jefferson not only wanted a government which protected and respected the liberty of its own citizens, but a government so realistic about human abuse of power that it would limit itself, provide for checks and balances which are the institutional expression of that healthy suspicion of power I mentioned earlier. In addition, he believed and managed to persuade a majority of his colleagues to agree, that both the state and religion would be better off if there were a radical and profound separation, and a radical freedom from government control or support of anybody's religion.

Jefferson would not have understood our concern about keeping religion out of politics. In fact, I observe that what people who want religion and politics to be compartmentalized usually mean is that they don't want their politics or economics criticized by anyone's religion. It's amazing how fast the far right and left, politically and religiously, can move on that issue.

Separation of church and state means, I would submit, the radical freedom of the individual here to be religious or not to be religious without any coercion or pressure from the majority's religion - whatever that might be - or the religion of the current administration. I would argue the importance of that radical freedom. I would argue that it is central to the democratic idea today.

The Democratic idea is very much alive. But it is fragile. I believe it comes under assault when the government starts writing the prayers for the classroom, or even when the government says it will be the policy here to pray. That invades a right that is unique and precious and fragile. It is under assault when zealous religionists try to press the government to institutionalize their brand of the truth. "Christian America" is a contradiction in terms. Mr. Jefferson's America has room for everybody.

Freedom of conscience, basic civil liberty is under assault today - from the left and the right. In Poland and in South Africa the government kills people for obeying their conscience. In Chile and the Soviet Union, in Korea - North and South - it is not healthy to advocate freedom of the human spirit. Free religious expression remains a threat to dictatorship and tyranny on either end of the spectrum.

Can the people rule? The human experience - accumulated through Middle Ages to modernity, through Renaissance and the upheavals of Reformation would indicate "yes, the people can rule." But that accumulated experience would teach us several lessons which each generation needs to learn anew....

that the people rule to the degree that their individual freedom of conscience is respected....

that freedom of the human spirit is a product of government consciously and intentionally limiting its own authority over individual consciences....

And that the radical Jefferson experiment of separation of church and state - not only expresses that spiritual freedom - but is a pretty good idea for all of us.

Bibliography

Bainton, Rolland. Here I Stand, A Life of Martin Luther. 1950.

Brinton, Crane. Ideas and Men, "The Story of Western Thought." 1950.

Bronwski, J., and Mazlish, Bruce. The Western Intellectual Tradition (Part I, Chapters 1-6). 1960.

Deanesly, Margaret. A History of the Medieval Church, 590-1500.. 1925.

Eco, Umberto. The Name of the Rose. 1980.

Elliot, William Y. and McDonald, Neil A. Western Political Heritage. 1950.
Chapter VI, "The Two Swords" pp. 288-318,
Chapter VII, "Government in the Middle Ages" pp. 319-375,
Chapter VIII, "The Protestant Revolt & Its Political Effects" pp. 376-416.

Fosdick, Harry Emerson. Great Voices of the Reformation. 1952.

Horwitz, Robert H. The Moral Foundations of the American Republic. 1977.

Manns, Peter. Martin Luther. 1983.

McNeill, William H. The Rise of the West, Part II. 1963.
Chapter VIII, "Barbarian Onslaught and Civilized Response"
Chapter X F, "The Far West" pp. 538-559.

Murray, John. We Hold These Truths.

Parker, T.H.L. Portrait of Calvin. 1954.

Sabine, George H. and Thorson, Thomas L. A History of Political Theory. 1973.

Southern, R.W. The Making of the Middle Ages. 1953.

Stephenson, Carl. Medieval Feudalism. 1943.

Thompson, Karl F., ed. Middle Ages, Renaissance, and Reformation, Vol. I.I "Classics of Western Thought." 1964.

Tierney, Brian. The Crisis of Church and State, 1050-1300. 1964.

Williams, George H. The Radical Reformation. 1962.